



# European Literature and the Ethics of Leadership: Cyrano de Bergerac

Yvon Pesqueux

## ► To cite this version:

Yvon Pesqueux. European Literature and the Ethics of Leadership: Cyrano de Bergerac. International Workshop on European Literature and the Ethics of Leadership, Apr 2008, Lyon, France. hal-00481226

**HAL Id: hal-00481226**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00481226>**

Submitted on 6 May 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**Euro SPES cahier 2008**

**Yvon PESQUEUX**

**CNAM**

**Professeur titulaire de la Chaire « Développement des Systèmes d'Organisation »**

**292 rue Saint Martin**

**75 141 Paris Cédex 03**

**Tél. 01 40 27 21 63**

**FAX 01 40 27 26 55**

**E-mail [pesqueux@cnam.fr](mailto:pesqueux@cnam.fr)**

**Site web [www.cnam.fr/lipsor](http://www.cnam.fr/lipsor)**

## **CV**

**Yvon PESQUEUX** is Professor at CNAM (Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers), head of the Chair « Développement des Systèmes d'Organisation ». Ph D. in Economics, University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne (1975), his special interests are Management, Philosophy and Ethics, Business and Society. He has published several scientific articles. His last books link Organization and Politics: Stakeholder Theory: A European Perspective (en collaboration avec Maria BONNAFOUS-BOUCHER), Palgrave-macmillan, Basingstoke, UK, 2005, Management de la connaissance - Knowledge Management & Apprentissage organisationnel & Société de la connaissance, Economica, Paris, 2006 (en collaboration avec Michel FERRARY), Gouvernance et privatisation, PUF, Paris, 2007, Management de la qualité, une analyse critique, Economica, Paris, 2008. His is also Editor of Society and Business Review (Emerald Publishing - [www.emeraldinsight.com/sbr.htm](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/sbr.htm)) and member of the SFM (Société Française de Management).

## European Literature and the Ethics of Leadership: Cyrano de Bergerac

### Abstract

This paper is built on an ‘organizational’ reading of ‘great’ texts, a reading focused on the *leader*, considering in an implicit way that he/she is a person with specific characters, circumstances being at left the background. This method is similar to the partial criticism made by the *queer critic* or the *colonial critic*. It is a reading, which consists in a de-contextualization of the literature from its category (the theater here) and its country to only retain what can be considered as relevant towards an archetype of the *leader*.

This method raises a major epistemological difficulty because of the ‘over’ consideration of the tragic and heroic characters of the *leader*. It is a way of generalizing the *leadership*, but within the universalism of the literature.

The following arguments of this text will be:

- an attempt to define the nature of an *organizational critic*,
- a short analysis of the cultural relativism to remind how far an archetypal production of a national culture can be understood (or not) in universal dimensions,
- an approach of the three notions of ‘figure’, ‘person’ and ‘portrait’,
- an analysis of the characteristics in common between Cyrano and the *leader*.

### Introduction

This text has been built on a very specific reading of literary texts, an ‘organizational’ reading according to the figure of the leader, considering in an implicit way that the person counts more than the circumstances. This method can be paralleled to the partial critics as the queer critic or the colonial critic of literature. It is a specific reading built on a de-contextualization of the literature genre (the theater here) to only stress what is relevant towards an archetype of the leader.

This kind of approach raises a major epistemological difficulty because of the reduction of the existential aspect of the leadership to an heroic character. It aims to confirm the general aspect of the leadership, but not in a universalism, this universalism being that of the literature.

The arguments of this text are as follows:

- an attempt to define the nature of an ‘organizational critic’,
- a short analysis of the cultural relativism to remind the milestones of the understanding of an archetypal masterpiece of a national culture in its universal aspects,
- an approach of the three dimensions advanced here, that of the figure, the character and the portrait,
- the characteristics in common between Cyrano and the leader.

### The colonial critic in literature as an example of a partial criticism and as a justification of an ‘organizational critic’

E W. Said (2000), in an extract of his work published in *Le Monde Diplomatique* demonstrates how major pieces of famous writers did not escape the colonial mentality of their time. This reading has been called a ‘colonial critic’ in literature. It is what creates the difficulty of the understanding of the Other. By discussing the general presentation made of A. Camus as a moral man, he underlines the importance of the immoral context of his texts

(the colonial Algerian framework of his texts seems fortuitous). E. W. Said's (p. 12-14) definition of culture is: "At a first place, it indicates all the practices - such as the arts of description, communication and representation - which has a certain autonomy regarding the Economics, the Social and the Politics, and often taking aesthetic forms among which one of the essential ends is pleasure. I naturally include there the popular knowledge on distant countries as well as the specialized discourses of erudite disciplines such as Ethnography, Historiography, Philology, Sociology and the history of literature (...). The second meaning of the word culture is almost imperceptibly established. Through certain connotations: the refinement, the elevation (...) culture considerably eases the devastation of the modern, urban, aggressive, mind-numbing life. We read Dante or Shakespeare to rise at the level of the best. And here is how the culture comes to be associated, on an often belligerent tone, to the nation or to the State. It is what makes the difference between 'them' and 'us', almost always with some xenophobia. In this sense, culture is a source of identity, quickly aggressive (...). In this second meaning, culture is a sort of theater where different causes, political and ideological causes, shout out (...) This idea of culture does not only lead to worship it, but also to consider it as totally separated from the daily realities because it transcends them". This is why we are asked 'to read our classics' and it is then that an establishment of a disjunction is made between the imperialist, racist or colonialist cruelty and the cultural productions in an identification process. And E. W. Said puts in perspective C. Dickens' *Great Expectations* and a modern Australia arisen from the conjunction of the thirst for profit and the logic of the empire builders, in brief a social apartheid. The method he has used consist in reading the masterpieces of great western writers and putting them in perspective towards this approach of culture to show the aspect of its (implicitly or explicitly) ethnocentricity without denying their contribution to what has been called 'the patrimony the humanity'. And he invites us in a demonstration by suggesting the idea of 'superimposed territories' and of 'muddled histories' as process of covering more precise interests. He advances this to make us accept the idea that a national culture is defined as a 'mask' in a process of impure past image washing towards a pure past or as a seclusion of the impure in a rhetoric of the disapproval. He puts in perspective the logic of the main stream based on the postulate of the recognition of the imperial experience which has then to remain the most hidden as possible.

It is necessary to stress the importance given here to the partial analysis of texts, which founds the project to try to understand what the characters of literature masterpieces reveal about the leader. It is here question to dissociate the work of the writer from that of the reader who renders explicit the implicit permanent structures in reference to simpler forms. The reading made here confirms a model of the leader and the assessment takes place after the inquiry, which consists in looking for the 'good' fiction. The human being is a storyteller and, if we had lived during the V<sup>o</sup> century BC, we would have narrated Ulysses' story, first 'big' discourse which can be considered as strategic for the western civilization or, at the same time, heroic and strategic. At the beginning of the XXI<sup>o</sup> century, it is no more question of telling Ulysses' story but its reduction to that of the leader if we limit ourselves to the heroic part. An organizational critic allows for a status of the heroes of the story.

The study of literary texts helps to try to understand the stakes. The chinks between the text and the archetypes (that of the leader for what concern us here) are the objects of this inquiry. As such, the texts used are considered as dialogues. Quite as for the colonial critic, this reading can be considered as partial. Let us underline two aspects of this reading: The accent put on the double dimension of the singular (the character in question) and of the generic (this singularity would have something to say in a generic way on the figure of the leader) and the accent put on another double dimension, that of the particular (in a cultural understanding)

and that of the universal which then exceeds the "French" cultural aspect of the character and of the text. Cyrano is read here to build a framing of the leader, which comes to confirm its characteristic. To advance these lines from a character consists in emphasizing the way the leader makes a narcissistic construction of the world. Such a reading builds a 'beautiful story' around a character which goes to the same direction than those told about the leaders. But such a reading may be as well driven in a critical perspective. It renews the status of the empirical in organization sciences, the empirical being built here on literary texts and not on case studies. For linguistics, literary texts are in a way considered as case studies but it is also something different because the analysis is built on a reading of these literary texts.

The reading made here builds a heroized aspect of the leader and of its criticism and it is made on two aspects:

- The stake in motto of organizational figures of the leader considered according to a subjective approach,
- The collection of enough elementary structures for an understanding of our society through the notion of leader.

These two aspects are completed by an attempt to build the anthropology of a leader into the universe of organizations.

Our work is a 'washing' process by only looking at Cyrano under the angle of the figure of the leader. The dimension of the character as an archetype of an 'eternal France' will be left under silence. The play was written at the end of the XIX<sup>e</sup> century in France, in a period when nationalism was extending in Europe with the French defeat of the war of 1870 which amputated France of Alsace and Lorraine. Arras's siege of 1640 is used as a counterpoint as far as it was a victory. But the play which immediately knew an enormous success, also served as a pole of identification for the nation at a time when it was worsened by the Dreyfus lawsuit. Cyrano is Gascon like Henri IV, a king who restored France after the religious wars. It is also a wink to the anti-Semitism that developed during the Dreyfus lawsuit. But the reference to Gascogne is also an important moment for the construction of the identity of France (against England with the 'One century war'). Cyrano's character benefits also from that of the musketeer, whose main features are bravery, loyalty to their king and guile. The leader can still be considered as a leader while being in the service of a king.

The reference to the figure of Gascon also contains, like in *The Three Musketeers*, the characteristic to be a figure of a man of wit.

### **The cultural relativism**

Such a reading resumes under another angle the question already raised by Goethe when he mentioned the double dimension of a literature masterpiece: its universalism and its cultural specificity. He raised the question to know what a non German could understand of a German literary masterpiece, moreover when it has been translated. The entry in the aesthetics of the original text is related with the question of a culturalist (or not) understanding. The aesthetics of the text translated into another language allows to enter the loss of the original aesthetics, without counting that a translation is also a re-interpretation. But he defended the universalist position under the name of a contribution in the patrimony of the humanity. This perspective raises moreover the question of the necessary knowledge of Cyrano by a non French. The organizational critic is in a way based on the evidence of the knowledge of the character by all. And at least comes the question, in this text, of the obligation (or not) to summarize the text before speaking about it.

A. Finkelkraut asks the question of the cultural relativism in *La défaite de la pensée* (1987) when he opposes the Enlightenment's ideas and the stakes in universality of the concepts of its political philosophy with the today developing cultural relativism. His demonstration is based on the reference to the French counter-revolutionary authors and the German romantics in their rehabilitation of the 'useful prejudices' they have given to the dignity of culture.

It is what takes place today with the gliding of the understanding of the concept of culture of the plan of the universality towards that of the contingent and the useful. It is as such that the social contract, in its vocation in the universality, is going to be questioned, the last version, the most relative, being expressed through the notion of 'stakeholder' today.

The author will comment C. Lévi-Strauss' position who defends the universality of the human condition by advancing the contradiction of the Enlightenment's ideas, without invalidating its concepts: the impossibility to classify in order of an increasing perfection the social organized forms of the humanity through space and time. In other words, it is an invalidation of the concept of civilization where the values defended by the philosophers of the Enlightenment were considered as a model. C. Lévi-Strauss' message is very subtle because it is not question of opening the Others to 'our' Reason but of opening us to the Reason of the Others. It is not a question of defending a 'Reasons' relativism. The rediscovery of societies without writings by the ethnologists of the XX<sup>e</sup> century leads to a quite other method than the reference to the natural man made by J.-J. Rousseau. It is then question of naturalizing the western culture by asserting the reference to an unconscious of same nature or, as M. Foucault (1966) underlines it in the right-thread of the philosophy of the suspicion, to assert an 'absolute dispersion' of systems of thought and social practices. The human being disappears as autonomous subject and becomes, as A. Finkelkraut accentuates, an 'object' on which play forces or structures. It ends in a conception, which legitimizes the fact that every group possesses its culture, every culture its moral values, its traditions and its rules of behavior and the 'tolerantist' reception to the culture of the Others. Let us remind that 'tolerantism' is a contemplative respect for the difference with the Others and expresses the will not to understand them. A. Finkelkraut underlines the xenophobic project which is anchored in the cultural relativism according to the acts of the XX<sup>e</sup> century. This is why he criticizes its legitimacy by emphasizing the ambiguity of the notion of multicultural society, which appears to defend the variety in front of the homogeneous. But this relativism is also reactionary. This position leads to subordinate ethical choices to ethnic reflexes with its inherent drifts. Moreover it is this relativist perspective which bases also the reference to tribalism and to localism, even to the *terroir* when it is considered in an ideological way. And A. Finkelkraut returns to Goethe and to his project of a universal literature by underlining how much the consideration of the differences exhausts its meaning by acting as if only a Frenchman could understand a French work, product of the French culture.

It is finally possible to underline the link between the relativist perspective and the utilitarian Reason: "Envisaging the world in a purely technical perspective, (the *bourgeois*) only admitted the practical realizations and the operational knowledge. And all the other things - all that was not functional, accountable, exploitable - was literature. In brief, it is the instrumental reason or, to speak as Heidegger, the 'calculating reason' that admitted the meditating reason (what we call here 'culture') in the sphere of the entertainment: "The technique considered as the supreme shape of the rational consciousness (...) and the absence of meditation considered as an organized, impenetrable incapacity to reach the link with 'what requires to be considered' are tied; they are one and only one thing" (1980)" (1987). The superiority given to the utilitarian Reason and the legitimacy of culturalism then lead to the rehabilitation of western individualism but merging with egoism (or, in a more sweetened way, the interest)

with autonomy and autonomy with freedom. Where Philosophy of the Enlightenment defended the idea that to fight ignorance was a factor of Freedom, the human being subjected to instincts and traditions he cannot be freed from, forgets the meaning of freedom.

### **Figure, character and portrait**

The organizational critic considers literature masterpieces as tales possessing the following characteristics: victory of the 'good' on the 'evil', of the 'hero' on the 'miserable', etc (Propp, 1970). A.-J. Greimas (1976) quotes the following aspects in the structure of a story: the qualifying test where the character acquires competence by learning, meeting, through initiatory rites, the decisive test where the character acts by surmounting the difficulties and the glorifying test where the character is recognized according to his actions and where he benefits from his actions because of the gratitude of others. This structure is also essential to the archetype of the leader from a model 'purpose - ideal - will' (Jullien, 1996). We are then faced to the copy we try to reproduce. The ideal is beyond the experience and it is towards this ideal that we try to practice. The leader draws the strategy to be realized from an understanding which conceives the best as subject to its will of realization. To be the best, indubitably the best, constantly the best. But F. Jullien invites us to wonder about the fact of knowing if this efficiency of the model we notice at the level of the production (*poesis*) can also be relevant in the action which has its end in itself (the *praxis*), in the order, as Aristotle wrote, not of what we 'make', but of what we 'accomplish'.

If the human being is a storyteller, it raises the problem of the passage from the stories to History because, before being spread, they are narrated. Let us before remind that History as a human science discipline goes back to the stories. This was underlined by H. Arendt who dates this filiation to Ulysses' guile told by Homer in the Odyssey, Ulysses' guile, which already succeeded in the story of the Trojan War guiles. But let us agree as well on the use made by Herodote of History and who have lead us to the current discipline the object of which being, afterward, to consider past lessons to understand, at the same time, the present and the future. The historic model is fundamentally explanatory, predictive and anachronistic. The passage of the storytelling in History is buildt on the status of the exemplary nature of the story. The uniqueness of the story feeds the generic aspect of the project of the storytelling. We spread stories by telling, and to tell, we expect the facts to enter the main lines of the story. The story, then turned into an example, feeds the ideology of an universality of figures (managerial figures, according to our field). The peculiarity of the story is only tolerated to advance the heroism of the leader as a person to glorify especially in his cunning manipulation of tools.

The story told is also a collection of 'good reasons' to tell it, 'good reasons' which find their roots only in the present of the content. The project to characterize an object of story from the leadership perspective, allows to justify that chosen characters can seem more relevant than others at a given moment. The chosen justifications carry the 'good reasons' for reading a story as we read it. An organizational critic is going to support the 'stories' in postures which are going to mix 'continuism' (in reference to a continuity between the character and the archetype of a leader) with some 'discontinuism' (in reference to a break between these two aspects), And it is this reference to a conception of time that builds the historicity of the posture. It is question here of taking the story as a demonstration of the substance of the leader.

An organizational critic is, after all, confronted with two obstacles:

- the representation of a way to act in the categories of an 'other', i.e. by references to an archetype,
- the difficulty to produce knowledge through stories.

In itself, it is question of validating a double dimension, theoretical and prophetic: theoretical in a project of rationalizing utilitarianism and prophetic because the production is also 'de-spiritualization' of the story. An organizational critic induces to consider in a very particular way stylistic forms, by operating as if, with the leader, it was question of finding a metaphor each time we use famous texts..

The interpretation of the metaphor is considered under three aspects of increasing dimension:

- the transport (shape of the classic rhetoric) which concerns the chosen words and the shape they indicate,
- the resemblance (which decoding comes from semiotic or semantic perspectives) which concerns the text,
- the 'co-naturality' (of hermeneutic order) which concerns the discourse and aims at the nearness of the references.

As P. Ricoeur (1975) underlines it, the metaphor supposes a co-reference between two terms, which bases what is going to create the signification of the metaphor. The most important aspect in the use of a metaphor is that of the liberation of the discourse. It induces a conception of the world from an invention. It is also necessary to indicate the simultaneity established between the object of origin and the invention of the world related with the metaphor. This is why it is necessary to envisage the status of the analogy in the process of knowledge used for representing the leader through the reference to such characters. Let us not forget the link established between the 'justification', which is connected to social interactions, and the 'fair', which is the legitimization of the adequate, the ability, in Organization Sciences, to characterize a topic like leadership. Indeed, the logic of the justification is going to put in evidence the 'good reasons' under the reference. In a way, the elements of a preexisting model will be justified and will come to strengthen the model in a process of auto-realization.

It is necessary also to refer to the notion of figure because, quite as the model, but in a more graphic way, the figure is an abstraction of the reality. A reduction in the main part, but also a model in a normative use of the term. The reference to figures is important in Organization Sciences: the leader, the customer, the shareholder are figures often mobilized today. But some similarities should be stressed with the notion of 'configuration'. The difference between a 'figure' and a 'configuration' results from the active aspect of the identification (with a figure) and of the passive aspect of the identification (with a configuration). But for the figure as for the configuration, let us underline that they preexist mostly before their use, as prejudged. It goes like this with 'key figures' such as the leader, the customer, the supplier, the shareholder, etc.

We can evoke the emergence of figures as the resultant of the combination of facts and 'stylized' persons, i.e. a partial representation. No human being was ever a leader, he has always been much more than. With the figure, it is question of an institutionalizing fiction in a performative way, i.e. tending to create the elements of 'reality' going with the discourse. It is a stereotype which can end on an ideal type (its clear face) as well as a prejudice (its dark face). As such, the use of a figure can be totally ideological (transformation of passions in values, simplification, incantation, distinction between friendly factors and enemy factors, etc. - cf. Baechler, 1976, Pesqueux, 1999). But also, quite as the concept of representation, that of the figure belongs to the lexical field of the theater with the notion of representation. The reference to the notion of figure is "beyond moral and aesthetic appreciations" as well as



scientific. In this domain, what matters at first, is not to know if something is good or bad, beautiful or ugly, false or true, but the kind of Figure to which it belongs” (Jünger, 2001).

The representation is far more a game of resemblance because it is made in the prospect of avoiding criticism. In this way, ‘figures’ and ‘representations’ are used to unveil the invisible, to represent it. It goes like this with characters (the leader for what concern us here) who, set up in a symbolic way as personas, then become figures. The leader is, like in a theater, a person that plays a role in the organization on the basis of an imagination (possibility to be identified with an ideal person or of hiding his personality) and of a functional aspect (in relation with a given situation), making possible the conception of an ideal type of the role coming to combine organizational goals with personal goals. And it is from the concept of role that we go to that of the game, i.e. the character authorized to play because he possesses the *ad hoc* status and because he knows the rules of the game. The trilogy ‘role - game - strategy’ also allows to evoke the notion of influence (Katz & Kahn, 1966). The influence opens the perspective of a deliberate representation at the same time interactionist and the duality ‘value rationality - procedural rationality (possibility to codify behaviors)’.

With the word ‘figure’, it is also possible to evoke that of the face, the figure allowing to give a face to the world, but without being obliged to specify it. The figure is more superficial than the face. We cannot ‘take’ the world with a figure by a glance, the figure allowing to see without seeing, to deform a face at which we cannot stare, to represent.

But representations and configurations can be at the origin of disfigurements, the first by mobilizing proofs going against them and the second by proposing an order of world but *in fine* fragile because not founded. And, regarding the organization, logos, slogans, persons transformed into characters and into figures build their representations. As L. Magne (2004) indicates, it is then question of creating ‘personified abstractions’ coming to clear the reductionism they operate because of the value judgment inherent to their use.

This argumentation is a way to indicate the precautions to be taken when it is question of confronting literary ‘heroes’ to found an analysis of literature masterpieces through the prism of leadership. Their heroism is de-contextualized from the masterpiece. This is why Cyrano’s romantic (nearly impressionist) is not relevant to our discussion.

It goes with Cyrano like with other characters of that type because it is here question of seeing what he can confirm of the leader, and also what he does not confirm. These characters have in common to be extraordinary persons (cf. Don Quixote), this extraordinary dimension being also what distinguishes the leader from the others, even if the extraordinary aspect of these characters aesthetically carry some extravagance. The work done here is doing a mix between a hero and a leader..

In Cyrano, numerous situations come to underline this. It is for example the case of the monologue of the nose (act I, scene 4), of that of the act I, scene 5 in which he composes a poem while fighting a duel, etc.

Cyrano serves here as a metaphor of the leader because it is through him that we try to find some key points of the leader. Because Cyrano as a character is deformed by the thickness of his nose, this reference seems to avoid the suspicion of disfigurement of the text operated by an organizational critic. The personage is more a character than a portrait (static). He is a figure which deepens the striking lines which are also object of wear through time. Moreover,

this wear is the object of the passage of Cyrano in the force of the age (at the beginning of the play) in a Cyrano fifteen years later. This also indicates the possible wear of the leader.

### **The characteristics common to Cyrano and to the leader**

#### **- Epic and aesthetic aspect (the beauty of the gesture and the theatricality)**

Cyrano is a brave warrior who handles the sword as well as the pen. He makes use of these two 'weapons' being unable to break his solitude (an archetypical characteristic of the leader). This solitude is here put in motto in a poignant way. He handles them gallantly. In the play, the dexterity of the manipulation of weapons and letters is the expression of the panache of the person, panache underlined by Cyrano's musketeer's suit, with the cape, the sword and the hat with a big feather. We find here two other characteristics of the leader: the mastery of the strategy and the rhetoric eloquence necessary to convince the others to follow him.

In a classic reading, Cyrano only exists regarding his feminine 'double', Roxane, queen of eloquence. But in a reading devoted to leadership, Cyrano and Roxane make one because the whole play is made so that they can be distinguished from the other personages. It is particularly the case in the scene 7 of the act III, the balcony scene during which Cyrano blows out the words repeated by Christian, who lacks eloquence, to seduce Roxane.

The theatricality is inherent to any play, because it is the base of its aesthetics. It's the same with the leader in its vocation to be staged. But let us underline how much the theatricality of Cyrano is in phase with the exhibitionist and obsessional dimension of the exercise of power inherent to leadership. Quite as Cyrano, the leader does not escape its role.

#### **- The bravery**

Cyrano possesses two dimensions of bravery: one connected to his personality and the other connected to circumstances. It is the collision of both which produces various scenes of the play (the scene of the balcony of the act III, scene 7, for example). The bravery of the hero pushes to the paroxysm of courage, also considered as being one of the archetypical aspects of the leader.

#### **- The imposture and to 'lie true'**

The position of power of the leader induces to have to 'lie true' to reach its purposes. It is there that the drift towards the toxic leader may appear (when they lie, but far from truth!). Cyrano is a master of the to 'lie true' towards his love for Roxane without doing this in a cynical way to reach his purposes. This 'to lie true' establishes the weft of the play quite as it constitutes the weft of the communication made by the leader. In both cases, the lie is not the goal because effects are expected. These lies are made in a purpose of manipulation in front of a justifiable credulity of the interlocutors. The lie is there to arouse the faith of the others regarding the person who lies. It comes in a sense not to disturb the reliable relation by a tear.

#### **- The greed of the duenna (metaphor of the employee) which facilitates the extraordinary dimension of the leader**

The duenna is in the play the archetype of the person in the service (act II, scene 5) with the low dimension of the greed, this dimension correlatively valuing Cyrano's higher dimensions (the generosity here). The greed can be considered as the representation of the archetypical

expectations of persons limited by subordination. On the other hand, Cyrano as leader is in the service of a king in a noble way. His subordinate position contrasts with that of the duenna by putting in evidence the dimensions of his cunning intelligence and his skill (his double skill in weapons and in letters). Both dimensions of the capacity are also activating the reactions of hatred and vengeance (that of the viscount of the act I, scene 4, for example). But the idea of delegation is also embedded with the 'double' (Cyrano and Christian), Christian being an *ante* hero (a foil), (between the hero and the non hero).

#### - **The importance of the appearance and the visible**

The appearance and the visible, these two aspects being situated in tension, build the duality which bases as well Cyrano's personage as that of the leader. The leader is characterized by the fact that he has to be visible. It is how he is recognized by the others. The game of the visible appearance is fundamental in Cyrano, especially towards minor characters as Lise (act II, scene 3) when he hides the pain and the importance of his wound as well as before Roxane for the moment of his death (act V, scene 5). It's the same for Roxane in the constancy of her pain (act V, scene 2) in which she reaffirms her allegiance to Christian even though he died 15 years ago. This importance of the appearance and the visible serves for masking the hidden, essential in the play, when Cyrano's constantly lie to Roxane on his love for her as on having expressed this love through the person of Christian. This cynicism of the appearance is also what bases the instrumentalization of the Other (subordinates as well as peers) for the purposes of the leader. It is also what bases the reputation and the support of the glorification, for Cyrano as well as for the leader.

#### - **The dissatisfaction**

The dissatisfaction is relevant for the leader as well as for Cyrano. It marks the tension establishing the substance of both personages. It is what does of the leadership a process which resists to time and not only a static notion. It is what we find in the failed Cyrano's quest of Roxane's love. Constance in the quest and the treason of the 'to lie true' are both dimensions of the connectivity of the leader which, because represented as such, is condemned at the same time in the solitude and in the connectivity. The never-ending quest, which characterizes Cyrano and Roxane is a representation of the interiorization and the embodiment of their mission, these two aspects being what allows to gather, in the same person, power and authority (like for the leader). It is necessary to wait for the end of the play, the death, ultimate wear, to undo the lie. In the same way, Roxane remains faithful to Christian much later his death. It is this never-ending quest which comes to tie up the certainty of the value of the person and the uncertainty of time. The certainty is here that of the friendship and of the love, the uncertainty is that of the circumstances. This durability of the quest is a call to the allegiance in the context and in the persons and marks the partiality inherent to the notion of loyalty. To be loyal is to choose his(her) friends. Cyrano should have normally fight in duel with Christian when he spotted about his nose (act II, scene 9)) as well as against the viscount (act I, scene 4).

#### - **Fractures**

The dramatic tension of the play founds the dualities of the friendship and the hatred, the becoming friend and the friendship (Cyrano and Christian), of the loving future and to be in love (Cyrano and Roxane, Roxane and Christian). The friendship is also what is there to prevent the treason, doing of Cyrano a 'certain' personage as well as it is the case with the leader. Friendship and treason have in common to ignore what is 'foreign'.

## References

- Baechler, Jean: 1976, *Qu'est-ce que l'idéologie ?*, Paris, Gallimard
- Finkielkraut, Alain: 1987, *La défaite de la pensée*, Paris, Gallimard
- Foucault, Michel: 1966, *Les mots et les choses*, Paris, Gallimard, Paris
- Greimas, Algirdas-Julien: 1976, « Préface », in J. Courtès, *Introduction à la sémiotique narrative et discursive*, Paris, Hachette Université
- Heidegger, Martin: 1980, *Dépassement de la métaphysique* in *Essais et conférences*, Paris, Gallimard, collection « Tel »
- Jullien, François: 1996, *Le traité de l'efficacité*, Paris, Grasset, Paris
- Jünger, Ernst: 2001, *Le travailleur*, Paris, Christian Bourgois Editeur, Paris, 2001 (édition originale, Berlin, 1932)
- Katz, Daniel & Kahn, Robert L.: 1966, 1978, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, New-York, John Wiley and Sons
- Magne, Laurent: 2004, *Le concept de « Sciences de Gestion » a-t-il un sens ? – Exploration de l'épistémologie des sciences de gestion*, Mémoire de DEA, Université de Paris IX-Dauphine
- Pesqueux, Yvon: 1999, "Discussing the Company: Model, Metaphor and Image", *Management Decision*, 37/10, p. 817-824
- Propp, Vladimir: 1970, *Morphologie du conte*, Paris, Seuil
- Ricoeur, Paul: 1975, *La métaphore vive*, Paris, Seuil
- Said, Edward W.: 2000, *Culture et impérialisme*, Paris, Fayard